Response to Office Action of 06/24/10

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application. amendments, Applicants do not acquiesce to the propriety of any of the Office's rejections and do not disclaim any subject matter to which Applicants are entitled. Cf. Warner Jenkinson Co. v. Hilton-Davis Chem. Co., 41 U.S.P.Q.2d 1865 (U.S. 1997).

## In the Claims

Claims 1, 14 and 22-34 have been cancelled. Claim 2 has been amended to incorporate the language of claim 1. Claim 20 has been amended to correct the amount of drug within the drug reservoir. Support for the amendment to claim 20 can be found in paragraph [66] of the specification. Claims 2-13 and 15-21 are now pending. No new matter has been introduced as a result of the claim amendments.

## Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by WO 00/25841.

Applicants have cancelled claim 1 and therefore this rejection has been rendered moot. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection on this basis.

## Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for stents, does not reasonably provide enablement for all drug delivery systems with this composition. Applicants have cancelled claim 14 therefore this rejection has been rendered moot. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection on this basis.

Claim 20 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants have amended claim 20 to recite the range of between 1 and 1,000 micrograms per stent. Support for this amendment can be found in the specification, at least in paragraph [66]. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection on this basis.

PATENT 1953233-00021

Application No.: 10/597,938 Group Art Unit: 1615

Response to Office Action of 06/24/10

Claim Objections

Claims 2-19 and 21 have been objected to as dependent on a rejected base

claim. Claim 2 has been amended to incorporate the language of claim 1 and as stated by the Office, is now allowable. As claims 3-21 depend, either directly or indirectly, from amended claim 2, these claims are also now allowable. Applicants thank the Office for

the favorable consideration of these claims

Conclusion

In light of the amendments presented supra, Applicants respectfully assert that

the pending claims are in condition for allowance and request that a timely Notice of

Allowance be issued in this case.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee which may be required in

connection with this Response to deposit account No. 50-3207.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 21, 2010

/Michelle Glasky Bergman/
Michelle Glasky Bergman, Ph.D.
Registration No. 54124
Customer No. 48423

K&L GATES, LLP

1900 Main Street, Suite 600 Irvine, California 92614-7319 Telephone: (949) 253-0900

Facsimile: (949) 253-0902